

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 ANKARA 004574

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR EB/TRA/OTP AND EUR/SE
PARIS FOR TSA AND ECON
DHS FOR COAST GUARD/MARITIME SECURITY - CRD LOSCIUTO
DEPT PASS TRANSPORTATION DEPT

SENSITIVE

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [EWWT](#) [PTER](#) [ETRD](#) [PREL](#) [TU](#)

SUBJECT: GOT Objects to Inclusion in Port Security

Advisory

Ref: (A) State 173908 (B) Rome 3096

(C) Miller/McCormick Email 8/13/04

Sensitive But Unclassified. Please Handle Accordingly.

[¶11.](#) (U) This message contains an action request in para [¶8.](#)

[¶12.](#) (U) Prior to receiving ref C email putting ref A demarche on hold, Econoff delivered demarche to MFA and the Turkish Maritime Administration advising that countries, including Turkey, which have reported less than full compliance with the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea's (SOLAS) International Ship and Port Facility Security Code (ISPS) will be included in a Port Security Advisory to be issued by the U.S. Coast Guard later in August.

[¶13.](#) (SBU) Gurcan Balik, of the MFA Maritime Affairs Department, responded that the GOT and Turkish ports had done a great deal to implement ISPS requirements, perhaps more than most European countries. He stressed that major Turkish ports, including those servicing trade with the United States, were in compliance. Balik explained that, of Turkey's 154 ports, 151 had approved port security assessments. Of these, 108 had approved port security plans and the Maritime U/S was working expeditiously to review the other plans submitted. (Embassy faxed copies of these lists of ports to U.S. Coast Guard and EB.) Ports which were not yet in compliance are minor players which do not service U.S. ports. Emphasizing that Port Security Advisory would have a negative effect on bilateral trade, Balik asked that the USG reconsider inclusion of Turkey in the advisory, or that the advisory clearly state that ships calling on ISPS-compliant Turkish ports would not be considered to pose additional security risks.

[¶14.](#) (U) Balik responded favorably to reftel's offer of consultations with the U.S. Coast Guard on these issues and suggested that the Maritime Administration should be the primary point of contact.

[¶15.](#) (SBU) Sitki Ustaoglu, Deputy Undersecretary of the Turkish Maritime Administration, did not comment on most elements of ref A demarche, but confirmed that the port facilities which have not been assessed by the Maritime U/S are generally marginal to international transport. He stated that Turkey has regularly provided the International Maritime Organization (IMO) with updates as to the status of ISPS implementation. In response to ref A's question, Ustaoglu said that he should be the primary GOT point of contact on these issues. He also reiterated his agency's interest in cooperation and information-sharing with USG agencies, and stated that the Maritime U/S is considering sending experts to view security arrangements implemented at U.S. ports.

[¶16.](#) (U) Embassy has not sent final letter, and per ref C, will refrain from doing so unless otherwise instructed.

Comment & Action Request

[¶17.](#) (SBU) While we fully support the need to bring our maritime partners into compliance with ISPS as quickly as possible, we agree with Embassy Rome's arguments in Ref B that the current strategy for doing so may not be the best way of bringing other countries on board. In particular, the threat of listing Turkey or others in a security advisory based on self-reported information and without adequate time to remedy deficiencies will merely encourage the Turks and others to cut corners to report full compliance to us and the International Maritime Organization.

[¶18.](#) (SBU) Action Request: Embassy urges Washington

agencies to reconsider the timing of the proposed advisory to allow us to work bilaterally to encourage Turkey's full compliance with the ISPS. Given that major Turkish ports shipping goods to the United States apparently comply with ISPS, Washington may want to reconsider inclusion of Turkey in the advisory, or at least specify in that advisory that port calls on ISPS-compliant ports in Turkey alone would not trigger additional security measures.

Edelman